

REMARKS

The amendments to the claims are supported by the claims as originally filed, and throughout the specification. Claims 43-45, 47-49, 51-53, 55-57, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21-37, 39-41, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, and 69 are in the case, of which Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, and 69 are active. No new matter is believed to be added by entry of these amendments.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Lam for the helpful and courteous interview held with Applicants' representative on May 20, 2003. During the discussion, it was noted that neither Shoji nor Burn describes a composite substance or conductive paste made by mixing a solvent with undried metal or metal compound particles.

The Examiner suggests that the term "undried" could refer to particles wetted with any liquid, such as a liquid surfactant. However, as used in the present application, the term "undried" refers to particles which have been washed with water, and from which water has not been removed. See the present specification at page 5, lines 4-10. This meaning of the term "undried" is reinforced by the comparative examples (i.e., at pages 10 and 13), wherein the conventional process of washing metal particles with water and then drying them is compared to composite substances and conductive paste prepared by Applicants' method, in which the washed metal particles are mixed directly with terpineol (e.g., embodiment 1 at page 8, line 18, to page 9, line 14).

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the definition of "undried" of the present application is proper because it is not repugnant to the colloquial usage of the terms "wet" and "dry." Thus, the term "undried" is properly defined in the specification in a manner consistent with well-established case law. See, for example, M.P.E.P. § 2111.01, citing *In re Hill*, 161 F.2d 367, 73 U.S.P.Q. 482 (CCPA 1947).

Neither Burn nor Shoji expressly describes "undried" metal powders (i.e., metal powders wetted with water). Rather, both references simply refer to various metal powders without indicating whether or not the powders have been dried. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the metal powders of Shoji and Burn cannot reasonably be considered inherently "undried" because, as shown by the examples and comparative examples of the present specification, metal powders may be either wetted with water or dried (i.e., water-free), depending on the processing conditions used. Applicants note that an inherent property be necessarily present not just probably or possibly present. See M.P.E.P. § 2163.07(a). Thus, the powders of Shoji and Burn are not necessarily "undried" before being mixed with a solvent. Accordingly, neither Shoji nor Burn describe the claimed invention.

As discussed above, the composite substance and conductive paste of the present invention are made by a process which is different from the process described in Shoji or Burn. The process of the present invention, by omitting a step in which washed metal particles (i.e., metal particles wetted with water) are dried before being mixed with a solvent, provides metal particles which are not aggregated as they are when the metal particles are dried prior to being mixed with a solvent. Thus, for example, the particle size distribution of metal particles in the claimed composite substance and conductive paste would be expected to be different from the particle size distribution found in conventional composite substances and conductive pastes prepared from dried metal powders (i.e., the conductive paste of Shoji and Burn). Conventional conductive pastes prepared from dried metal powders, are quite different from those of the present invention, prepared from undried powders, as shown by the comparative data of the present specification.

At pages 9-11, Applicants have compared a conductive paste made by the process of the present invention, with an otherwise identical conductive paste prepared by a conventional process in which Ni metal particles are dried prior to being mixed with an

organic solvent (see page 10, lines 1-16). The difference between the conventional conductive paste, prepared from dried metal powders, and the claimed conductive paste, prepared from an undried metal powder, is shown in Table I at page 11 of the present specification. The claimed conductive paste (Test Piece No. 1) has higher dry sheet density, and substantially lower roughness compared to a conductive paste (Test Piece No. 2) prepared from a dried metal powder. Likewise, a Ag conductive paste prepared using "undried" metal powders (Test Piece No. 3) has a substantially higher dry sheet density and lower roughness compared to a Ag conductive paste prepared from a dried Ag powder (Table II at page 14 of the present specification). Thus, the claimed composite substance and conductive paste prepared from undried metal powders have improved properties compared to those prepared from conventional dried metal powders, due to the lack of metal powder aggregates in the claimed composite substance and conductive paste.

As discussed above, the method of preparing a composite substance and conductive paste from "undried" powders provides a different composite substance or conductive paste in which the aggregates found in conventional conductive pastes are not found (present specification at page 4, lines 5-16). Thus, the composite substance and conductive paste of the claimed invention are different from conventional composite substances and conductive pastes prepared from dried metal powders (i.e., the composite substances and conductive pastes of Shoji and Burn). Moreover, the claimed composite substance and conductive paste have superior properties (i.e., little or no aggregates) compared to conventional composite substances and conductive pastes, as shown by the comparative data described above. Thus, not only do Shoji and Burn fail to anticipate the claimed composite substance and conductive paste, but Shoji and Burn also fail to suggest the claimed composite substance and conductive paste.

Furthermore, a "particular parameter must first be recognized as a result-effective variable, i.e., a variable which achieves a recognized result, before the determination of the optimum or workable ranges of said variable might be characterized as routine experimentation." M.P.E.P. § 2144.05(II)(B). Because neither Shoji nor Burn recognize that preparing a composite substance or conductive paste from undried metal powders is result-effective in regard to the properties of the composite substance or conductive paste, it would not be obvious to modify the processes of Shoji and Burn to provide the claimed composite substance and conductive paste. Thus, Shoji and Burn neither anticipate nor suggest the claimed invention.

In regard to the withdrawn claims, Applicants note that M.P.E.P. § 821.04 states, "if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined." As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the elected product claims are allowable, and therefore request rejoinder of the non-elected process claims.

Accordingly, and for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn. Applicants submit that the claims are now allowable, and early notification thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Thomas A. Blinka, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,541

*J. Derek Mason, Ph.D.
Registration No. 35,270*



22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
NFO/TAB/kst